



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Am
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,551	08/05/2003	Tadashi Ohashi	1341.1159	6667
21171	7590	05/18/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ORTIZ, BELIX M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/633,551	OHASHI, TADASHI
	Examiner Belix M. Ortiz	Art Unit 2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications files on 18-January-2005, the specification of the disclosure, and claims 1-3 and 7-10 are amended per applicant's request. Therefore, claims 1-10 are presently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being Makus et al. by (U.S. Pre-grant publication 2002/0059210).

As to claim 1, Makus et al. teaches a computer program that makes a computer (see paragraph 38) execute:

setting a specific element from an installation space where each element to be given a name is hierarchically expressed (see figure 3-8);

generating a name space ontology based on name information, and storing the name space ontology generated to a first database, wherein the name space ontology is a group of name candidates with the specific element being set as a top level (see figure 3 and paragraphs 3-4, 6, and 10); and linking each name constituting the name space ontology with multimedia information and storing the multimedia information to a second database (see figure 8 and paragraphs 16, 48, and 56-57).

As to claim 2, Makus et al. teaches wherein the generating includes generating the name space ontology according to the specific element being set (the actual ontology which is generated depends on the set element. For example, when the set element is "Travel and Transport", the specific ontology illustrated in FIGS. 3-8 is produced. Different ontologies are produced when different names are selected).

As to claim 3, Makus et al. teaches the computer program further making the computer execute deciding whether to give the specific element set a name from the name candidates in the name space ontology (see paragraph 41).

As to claim 6, Makus et al. teaches wherein the generating includes obtaining name information with an extension (Names in the ontologies can include extensions. In FIG. 4. the name "Airlines" can include the extension

"Major" or "Regional". Extensions can also be considered names, which are below a given name in the hierarchy. For example, in FIG. 5, the name "Airlines-International" could have the extension "Aer Lingus Irish" or the extension "Aero California").

As to claim 7, Makus et al. teaches the computer program further making the computer execute setting a security gate based on an environment in which the name is used, wherein the security gate limits a range of names that can be searched for or referred to (The computer program illustrated in FIGS. 3-5 illustrates a "security gate" in the sense that once a name is selected, only specific names are presented to the user. For example, in FIG. 3, if the user selects "Aviation", they are only presented aviation listings, and are not given access to maritime or weather information until they return to the home page).

As to claim 8, Makus et al. teaches the computer program further make the computer execute
searching for a name corresponding to the name space ontology and multimedia information that is linked with the name (see paragraphs 56 and 57), and
outputting a result of the search corresponding to the security gate (in FIGS. 5-8, users traverse down the ontology and thus perform a search for the multi-media information shown in FIG. 8. FIG. 8 shows the output of the search

where the search has been performed. The search is limited to aviation information and other available information, such as maritime and weather information is not presented)..

As to claim 9, Makus et al. teaches a multimedia processing apparatus comprising:

a first database (see paragraphs 14-15 and 19);
a second database (see paragraphs 14-15 and 19);
a setting unit that sets a specific element from an installation space where each element to be given a name is hierarchically expressed (see figure 3-8);
a generating unit that generates a name space ontology based on name information, and stores the name space ontology generated to the first database, wherein the name space ontology is a group of name candidates with the specific element being set as a top level (see figure 3 and paragraphs 3-4, 6, and 10);
and
a linking unit that links each name constituting the name space ontology with multimedia information and stores the multimedia information to the second database (see figure 8 and paragraphs 16, 48, and 56-57).

As to claim 10, Makus et al. teaches a multimedia processing method comprising:

setting a specific element from an installation space where each element to be given a name is hierarchically expressed (see figure 3-8); generating a name space ontology based on name information, and storing the name space ontology generated to a first database wherein the name space ontology is a group of name candidates with the specific element being set as a top level (see figure 3 and paragraphs 3-4, 6, and 10); and linking each name constituting the name space ontology with multimedia information and storing the multimedia information to a second database (see figure 8 and paragraphs 16, 48, and 56-57).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makus et al. (U.S Pre-grant publication 2002/0059210) in view of Chaudhuri et al (US Pre- grant Publication 2004/0003005).

As to claim 4, Makus et al. does not teach wherein the generating includes collating obtained name information with previously obtained name information, and checking duplication of names based on the collation.

Chaudhuri et al. teaches detecting duplicates records in databases (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein the generating includes collating obtained name information with previously obtained name information, and checking duplication of names based on the collation (see paragraphs 4 and 12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Makus et al. to include wherein the generating includes collating obtained name information with previously obtained name information, and checking duplication of names based on the collation.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Makus et al. by the teaching of Chaudhuri et al., because wherein the generating includes collating obtained name information with previously obtained name information, and checking duplication of names based on the collation, would enable the computer program to identify and eliminate duplicates of data presented to the user.

As to claim 5, Makus et al. teaches wherein the generating includes checking the duplication of names within a domain to which the name information belongs (A domain can be a portion of the ontology, such as all the names under the heading "Aviation" illustrated by Makus et al. in FIGS. 4-8).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 18- January- 2005 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive:

In response to applicants' arguments that "Makus et al., does not teach or suggest such a linking of each name in the ontology with the multimedia information", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, because Makus et al. teaches Each name in the ontology is linked to a lowest level in the hierarchy, shown in FIG. 8. This lowest level displays multimedia information, including a symbol (87), a telephone number and a website address.

In response to applicants' arguments that "Makus et al., does not teach or suggest the generating of a name space ontology based on a specific set element", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, because Makus et al. teaches a different ontology when different name are selected (see figures 3-8).

In response to applicants' arguments that "Makus et al., does not teach or suggest generating a name space ontology based on name information, and storing the name space ontology generated to a first database wherein the name space ontology is a group of name candidates with the specific element being set

as a top level", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, because Makus et al. teaches generating a name space ontology based on name information, and storing the name space ontology generated to a first database wherein the name space ontology is a group of name candidates with the specific element being set as a top level (see figure 3 and paragraphs 3-4, 6, and 10).

"The most logical way to organize data to facilitate rapid and efficient retrieval of desired facts is to first arrange the data in a rational hierarchical structure that is organized along the lines in which people typically think when "zeroing in" on a desired piece of information. It will generally be easier for a user to view a limited number of subjects at the highest level of the hierarchy, select one of the subjects that seems most relevant to the desired information, and then select a category under the selected subject that seems most relevant" (see Makus et al., paragraph 4).

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Belix M. Ortiz whose telephone number is 571-272-4081. The examiner can normally be reached on moday-friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 571-272-4083. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

bmo

May 10, 2005



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER